

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-15, 27, 29-32, 42 and 43 are pending, of which claims 1, 27 and 42 are independent. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Independent claims 1, 27, and 42 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,046,778 ("*Martin*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,958,973 ("*Chen*").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature of claim 7. Claim 7 has been canceled. As amended, claim 1 recites "dynamically binding an event context to an execution context ... by: maintaining the execution context in an idle state until an event arrives at a head of a global event queue that is accessible by event contexts; ... and associating ... an event queue with the execution context to temporarily store events for the event context for a duration of the dynamic binding."

Neither *Martin* nor *Chen* taken alone or together is understood to teach or suggest at least these features of amended claim 1. In rejecting claim 7, the Examiner cites figures 4-6 and associated text of *Chen* as teaching maintaining execution contexts in an idle state until an event arrives at a head of a global event queue. These portions of *Chen* describe a process of forwarding packets in sequence to ports using a global output queue that is shared by port output queues related to the ports.¹ The applicants do not understand these portions of *Chen* to teach or suggest, at least, "dynamically binding an event context to an execution context ... by: maintaining the execution context in an idle state until an event arrives at a head of a global event queue that is accessible by event contexts; ... and associating ... an event queue with the execution context to temporarily store events for the event context for a duration of the dynamic binding."

Further, *Martin* is not understood to remedy at least this deficiency of *Chen*. *Martin* describe routing messages and events to appropriate application and processing contexts.² Further, *Martin* describes, in the context of fault tolerance, dynamically binding tasks (e.g., threads or processes) with application contexts.³ As such, the Applicant does not understand *Martin* to teach or suggest at least the foregoing features of amended claim 1.

¹ Column 8, line 27, to column 10, line 50 of *Chen*.

² Column 35, line 62, to column 36, line 20, and column 36, lines 39-42 of *Martin*.

³ Column 30, lines 10-45 of *Martin*.

Should this rejection be maintained, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to specifically identify exactly where Chen or Martin describes or suggests the features of amended claim 1. In view of the foregoing, claim 1 as amended is believed patentable.

Independent claims 27 and 42 have also been amended. Claim 28 has been canceled. For at least a similar reason given for independent claim 1, claims 27 and 42 are patentable.

Regarding claims 12-14, the Examiner stated that these claims are objected to for being dependent on a rejected base claim, but are allowable if rewritten in independent form. The Applicant acknowledges that these claims are patentable.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons for which the claims on which they depend are patentable.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Any circumstance in which the Applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the Examiner does not mean that the Applicant concedes other comments of the Examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the Applicant concedes any of the Examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

No fee is believed due. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050 referencing Attorney Docket No. 10559-0875001 / P17394.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 5, 2009

/Denis G. Maloney/
Denis G. Maloney
Reg. No. 29,670

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945